## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 38-49, and 75-86 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 37, 74, and 111 have been amended as discussed below. Claims 74 and 111 have also been amended to recite sublingual and intranasal delivery compositions, respectively, instead of oral delivery compositions. Claims 112-119 have been amended to depend from claim 128. Claims 120-127 have been amended to depend from claim 129. New claims 128-189 have been added. Support for claims 128-189 is found at, for example, page 15, lines 4-19, of the specification, and original claims 55 and 64. Claims 138-150 and claims 164-176 are substantively identical to claims 112-119 and 128 but depend from claims 18 and 92, respectively. Claims 151-163 and 177-189 are substantively identical to claims 120-127 and 129 but depend from claims 27 and 101, respectively. Claims 13-37, 50-74, and 87-189 are pending and at issue.

Claim 37 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The Examiner asserts that the term "mimetic" in claim 37 lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 37 has been amended to recite "a mimetic, the mimetic being a mimetic of a subcutaneous delivery composition prepared by the method of claim 13." Claims 74 and 111 have similarly been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the term "mimetic" has proper antecedent basis.

Claims 13-16, 18, 23-25, 27, 32, 50-53, 55, 60-62, 64, 87-90, 92, 97-99, 101, 106 and 112-127 have been rejected as obvious over Morishita (U.S. Patent No. 4,873,087) or Kakeya (U.S. Patent No. 4,442,090).

The preamble of the pending claims recite that the compositions described therein are for subcutaneous, sublingual, or intranasal administration.

Applicants respectfully submit that the preamble in each of these claims is limiting since it is "necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality' to the claim". See M.P.E.P. §2111.02.

Morishita and Kakeya do not disclose or suggest subcutaneous, intranasal, or sublingual delivery routes. In fact, at page 3 of the March 21, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner states that "Morishita does not specifically teach subcutaneous, intranasal or sublingual delivery routes." Rather Morishita and Kakeya disclose formulations for rectal administration. See the title of Morishita ("Suppository Preparation Having Excellent Absorption Property") and the abstract of Kakeya ("The compounds are combined with pharmacologically-active ingredients, with pharmaceutical bases suitable for rectal administration of drugs …").

Claims 13-37, 50-74 and 87-127 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,071,538 and U.S. Patent No. 6,221,367.

While not conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, in order to advance prosecution, applicants will submit a terminal disclaimer upon the finding of allowable subject matter.

Respectfully submitted,

√ay/P. Lessler

Reg. No. 41,151

**Attorney For Applicants** 

DARBY & DARBY P.C. Post Office Box 5257 New York, NY 10150-5257 (212) 527-7700